UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,735	08/17/2001	Dinesh C. Verma	YOR920010700US1	6228

7590   10/05/2006

Law Office of Ido Tuchman
69-60 108th Street
Suite 503
Forest Hills, NY   11375

EXAMINER
AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 July 2006</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to correspondence filed 03 July 2006.

2.   Claims 1-32 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. .   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Callaghan et al. (US 2002/0007317), hereinafter referred to as Callaghan, in view of

Davis et al. (US 5,796,952), hereinafter referred to as Davis, and further in view of

Vange et al. (US 2002/0023159 A1), hereinafter referred to as Vange.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art

only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome

by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an

invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject

matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed

in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR

1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and

reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the

application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer

in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing

that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under

35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

5.   Regarding claims 1, 11, 14, and 21, Callaghan teaches a method comprising

employing a first web server in a first DNS domain, and a second web server in a

second DNS domain (p. 3, par. 0050), wherein the first web server uses a first user

tracking mechanism to collect client information (p. 3, par. 0049 and 0050) and stores

the client information as a client record in a database (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and

p. 8, par. 0117). Read broadly, a database can be any type of data structure that stores

data and therefore the storing of client data by Callaghan reads on the limitation of

utilizing a database to store a client record. This feature in the art is evidenced by

Davis, wherein Davis demonstrates in figure 4 the method wherein multiple locations

can save client information directly to a database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize a database when

storing client information. One would have been motivated to utilize database because,

as is known in the art, databases are widely used for storing mass amounts of different

types of information.

Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly

recite the limitations of "the first web server directing a client to access a resource at the

second web-server", "said resource encapsulating information about a location of the

client record in the database", "the second web server decapsulating the location and

retrieving the client record from the database", and "the second web server using the

client record in conjunction with a second user tracking mechanism", however in related

art, Vange teaches on these limitations. Vange teaches a first process and a second

process which are located within separate domains and further teaches the use of a

redirection command which instructs the user at one domain to access resources at a

second domain (p. 2, para. 0018, 3-6) which teaches on the limitations of "the first web

server directing a client to access a resource at the second web-server". Vange further

teaches in paragraph 18 the encapsulation of parameter which is passed which stores

information related to client record information which reads on "said resource

encapsulating information about a location of the client record in the database", "the

second web server decapsulating the location and retrieving the client record from the

database", and "the second web server using the client record in conjunction with a

second user tracking mechanism". In view of Callaghan and Davis, it would have been

obvious for this parameter to include information pertaining to the client including client

state information stored in the database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify the combination as taught

by Callaghan and Davis with the teachings of Vange, the database storage of client

information method, with the parameter sharing as disclosed by Vange in order to be

able to share client record information that is stored in a database accurately and

securely. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a

combination for the reasons stated above, wherein a user would be able to share

private information in the form of cookies across domains (see Vange, p. 2, para. 0016,

lines 9-12).

6.   Regarding claim 2, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method wherein the

first and second user tracking mechanisms use cookies for storing the user client

information (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0043). The rationale and motivation used to

combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 2.

7.   Regarding claim 3, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method wherein the

first web server authenticates the client, and the client record includes user

authentication data enabling the second web server to use a common sign-on with the

sign-on of the first web server (Callaghan, p. 6, para. 0085-0087). The rationale and

motivation used to combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 1 applies equally as

well to claim 3.

8.   Regarding claim 4, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method wherein the

first web server stores within the client record at least one parameter which determines

at least one characteristic of at least one page to be sent to the client by the second

web server (Callaghan, p.1, para. 0004-0005). The rationale and motivation used to

combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 4.

9.   Regarding claim 5, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method wherein the

parameter includes at least one user preference (Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0004-0005).

The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 1

applies equally as well to claim 5.

10.   Regarding claim 6, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method wherein said

at least one user preference is related to at least one detected purchasing habit

(Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0005). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan,

Davis and Vange in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 6.

11.   Regarding claim 7, Callaghan teaches a method comprising employing a first

web server in a first DNS domain, and second web server in a second DNS domain (p.

3, para. 0049-0050), enabling said first and second web servers to share cookie

information (p. 3, para. 43); and coordinating cookies across said first and second

domains (p. 3, para. 0046-0049), and storing a client record in a database by the first

web server (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117). Read broadly, a

database can be any type of data structure that stores data and therefore the storing of

client data by Callaghan reads on the limitation of utilizing a database to store a client

record. This feature in the art is evidenced by Davis, wherein Davis demonstrates in

figure 4 the method wherein multiple locations can save client information directly to a

database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would

have found it obvious to utilize a database when storing client information. One would

have been motivated to utilize database because, as is known in the art, databases are

widely used for storing mass amounts of different types of information.

        Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly

recite the limitation of "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates

information about a location of the client record in the database", however in related art,

Vange teaches on this limitations. Vange teaches a first process and a second process

which are located within separate domains and further teaches the use of a redirection

command which instructs the user at one domain to access resources at a second

domain (p. 2, para. 0018, 3-6). Vange further teaches in paragraph 18 the

encapsulation of parameter which is passed which stores information related to client

record information which reads on "creating a link to the second web server that

encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database". In view

of Callaghan and Davis, it would have been obvious for this parameter to include

information pertaining to the client including client state information stored in the

database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would

have found it useful to modify the combination as taught by Callaghan and Davis with

the teachings of Vange, the database storage of client information method, with the

parameter sharing as disclosed by Vange in order to be able to share client record

information that is stored in a database accurately and securely. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated

above, wherein a user would be able to share private information in the form of cookies

across domains (see Vange, p. 2, para. 0016, lines 9-12).

12.   Regarding claim 8, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method wherein the

step of coordinating is performed by a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and

second Web-Servers (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049). The rationale and motivation

used to combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 7 applies equally as well to claim

8.

13.   Regarding claim 9, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method further

comprising providing a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and second Web-

Servers to perform the step of coordinating (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049). The

rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 7

applies equally as well to claim 9.

14.   Regarding claim 10, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method wherein the

step of enabling includes the first web server setting a first cookie having a first identity

and the second web server setting a second cookie having a second identity, and the

step of coordinating maps the first and second identities to a third identity shared across

said first and second domain (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053-0056). The rationale and

motivation used to combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 7 applies equally as

well to claim 10.

15.   Regarding claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 22, in accordance with claims 1, 7, 1, 7,

11, and 21, respectively, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach an article of manufacture

comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code

means... (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

16.   Regarding claim 18, Callaghan discloses a method comprising employing a first

web server in a first DNS domain, and a second web server in a second DNS domain,

wherein the first web server maintains a first private cookie at a browser and the second

web server maintains a second private cookie at the browser (p. 3, par. 0049 and 0050,

p. 4, 0053 and 0054); accessing a cookie coordinator when the first private cookie is

received by the first web-server (p. 4, para. 0056); mapping a first identity in the first

private cookie and a second identity in the second private cookie to a single identity

common across the multiple domains (p. 4, para. 0053); storing a client record in a

database by the first web server (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117).

Read broadly, a database can be any type of data structure that stores data and therefore the storing of client data by Callaghan reads on the limitation of utilizing a database to store a client record. This feature in the art is evidenced by Davis, wherein Davis demonstrates in figure 4 the method wherein multiple locations can save client information directly to a database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize a database when storing client information. One would have been motivated to utilize database because, as is known in the art, databases are widely used for storing mass amounts of different types of information.

Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly recite the limitation of "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database", however in related art, Vange teaches on this limitations. Vange teaches a first process and a second process which are located within separate domains and further teaches the use of a redirection command which instructs the user at one domain to access resources at a second domain (p. 2, para. 0018, 3-6). Vange further teaches in paragraph 18 the encapsulation of parameter which is passed which stores information related to client record information which reads on "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database". In view of Callaghan and Davis, it would have been obvious for this parameter to include information pertaining to the client including client state information stored in the database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would

have found it useful to modify the combination as taught by Callaghan and Davis with

the teachings of Vange, the database storage of client information method, with the

parameter sharing as disclosed by Vange in order to be able to share client record

information that is stored in a database accurately and securely. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated

above, wherein a user would be able to share private information in the form of cookies

across domains (see Vange, p. 2, para. 0016, lines 9-12).

17.   Regarding claim 19, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the method further

comprising using the single identity to look up the identity of users across the different

domains (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053), and the cookie coordinator learning the mapping

of the various cookies that are placed independently on the browser by the different

servers (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053). The rationale and motivation used to combine

Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 18 applies equally as well to claim 19.

18.   Regarding claim 20, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the use of a program

storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions...

(Callaghan , p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046). The rationale and motivation

used to combine Callaghan, Davis and Vange in claim 18 applies equally as well to

claim 19.

19.   Regarding claims 23, 25, 27, and 29, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach the

method further comprising wherein the database is a cookie coordination database (p.

3, para. 0046-0049). Read broadly, a database can be any type of data structure that

stores data and therefore the storing of client data by Callaghan reads on the limitation

of utilizing a database to store a client record. This feature in the art is evidenced by

Davis, wherein Davis demonstrates in figure 4 the method wherein multiple locations

can save client information directly to a database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize a database when

storing client information. One would have been motivated to utilize database because,

as is known in the art, databases are widely used for storing mass amounts of different

types of information. wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second

Web-Server includes sending the client a link to the second Web-Server (p. 5, para.

0071-0073).

Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly

recite the limitation of "wherein directing the client to access the resource at a second

web-server includes sending the client a link to the second web-server", however in

related art, Vange teaches on this limitations. Vange teaches a first process and a

second process which are located within separate domains and further teaches the use

of a redirection command which instructs the user at one domain to access resources at

a second domain (p. 2, para. 0018, 3-6). Vange further teaches in paragraph 18 the

encapsulation of parameter which is passed which stores information related to client

record information which reads on "wherein directing the client to access the resource at

a second web-server includes sending the client a link to the second web-server". In

view of Callaghan and Davis, it would have been obvious for this parameter to include

information pertaining to the client including client state information stored in the

database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would

have found it useful to modify the combination as taught by Callaghan and Davis with

the teachings of Vange, the database storage of client information method, with the

parameter sharing as disclosed by Vange in order to be able to share client record

information that is stored in a database accurately and securely. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated

above, wherein a user would be able to share private information in the form of cookies

across domains (see Vange, p. 2, para. 0016, lines 9-12).

20.   Regarding claims 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, and 32, Callaghan, Davis and Vange teach

the method wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-

Server includes sending a HTTP response code from the first Web-Server configured to

cause the client to be redirected to the second Web-Server using HTTP redirection.

(Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well known

HTTP technology methods). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan,

Davis and Vange in claims 1, 7, 14, 18, and 21 applies equally as well to claims 24, 26,

28, 30, 31, and 32.

Response to Arguments

21.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

22.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sampson et al. (US 6,339,423 B1) teaches multi-domain access control.

O'Neil et al. teach a personal information security and exchange tool.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

baa